

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-25 are pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application.

In response to the Office Action dated May 25, 2011, Claims 1-25 remain unchanged. No new subject matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application.

Rejection of Claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,018,768 (Ullman) in view of US 6,326,982 (Wu)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-25. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Ullman and Wu does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations as set forth in independent claims 1 and 14. For example, independent claim 1 and 14 recite “the STB transmit[ting the] current tuned channel number to the auxiliary display device” and “the auxiliary display device determin[ing] a particular uniform resource locator (URL) associated with the current tuned channel number utilizing the current tuned channel number provided by the STB” which are not taught or suggested in the combination of Ullman and Wu.

Applicant also submits that the combination of Ullman and Wu does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations as set forth in independent claims 7 and 21. For example, independent claim 7 recites “the STB transmitting the VCM [the VCM including uniform resource locator (URL) information associated with at least one program channel] to the auxiliary display device”, “the STB transmitting the current tuned channel number to the auxiliary display device”, and “the auxiliary display device correlating the current tuned channel number to a particular URL contained in the VCM utilizing the current tuned channel number provided by the STB” and independent claim 21 recites “the STB transmits the current tuned channel number to the auxiliary display device via the remote server and the auxiliary device determines the web page to be displayed utilizing the current tuned channel number provided by the STB” which are not taught or suggested in the combination of Ullman and Wu.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the following assertion on page 9 in “Examiner’s response” section of the Office Action:

“Ullman discloses...a specialized interface software 106 acts as an interface between the video programming and the internet functions and then retrieves URLs from the internet connections, interprets these URLs and direct the JAVA enabled browser to retrieve the particular relevant Web pages and synchronize the retrieved Web pages to the video content for display on the user's computer (Col 7 lines 42-53). Thus recitations from above, clearly shows the program related information from the digital cable box is required to be sent to the PC 16 in order for the PC to identify the corresponding URLs for particular Web pages and displays the Web pages on the PC so as to be synchronous with the video programming on the TV.”

Ullman is directed towards a system for integrating video programming with information resources of the internet. Ullman discloses that a *local PC or a digital cable box* receives video signals and link files including URLs directly from a server. Alternatively, the link files can instead be received directly over the internet or another data channel. The PC or the digital cable box decodes and retrieves web pages corresponding to the URLs included in the link files and displays the web pages along with the corresponding video program on a display screen. Ullman, at best, discloses that a client software in either the digital cable box or the PC decodes the URLs and displays the web pages and the video content on a single display monitor or on separate display monitors. See Ullman, col. 7, lines 42-53 and col. 9, lines 52-55. Ullman’s system is based upon using either the PC or the digital cable box in *two separate embodiments to receive and decode link files*.

Therefore, Ullman cannot propose that any information is sent *from the digital cable box to the PC*. Further, Ullman nowhere shows or suggest transmitting any channel number from the PC (or the digital cable box) to any computer screen, the TV, or any other additional device. Ullman also does not teach determining the URL to be displayed using the channel number by the TV or by the computer screen.

Further, Applicant also disagrees with the following assertion on page 10 in “Examiner’s response” section of the Office Action:

“As Examiner mentions above, the related programming information is required by the PC which functions as an equated auxiliary device, in order to identify the related URLs from the link files received earlier or during the programming; the link files include URLs and related programming information such as program

title and additional information etc (Col 6 lines 36-49). The link file is not clear about the tuned channel number, Wu reference thus is brought in to show the channel number also can be used to identify the related URLs. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the tuned channel number is closely tied to a received program and would have also used the corresponding channel number as an alternative to identify a broadcast program.”

Wu is directed towards a method for automatically accessing web pages by a client from a server. Wu teaches that a web/TV client receives a mapping unit information including a time frame parameter and a channel parameter for each segment of video data. Wu, at best, discloses that based on a selected channel parameter, the web/TV client determines web addresses and retrieves the corresponding web pages and displays them on a TV. See Wu, col. 12, lines 7-10, col. 12, lines 19-25, and col. 12, lines 51-60. Although Wu’s channel parameter can be used to identify URLs or links, Wu does not show or suggest transmitting the mapping unit information or the channel parameter to the TV. Further, Wu’s TV does not determine the URL based on any channel number.

Therefore, determining the URL is performed by the digital cable box (or PC) in Ullman and by the web/TV client in Wu. These devices can be equated to Applicant’s STB. However, both the references fail to teach any auxiliary display device (such as the TV, screen, etc) determining the URL. Therefore, the combination of Ullman and Wu does not show or suggest “the STB transmit[ting the] current tuned channel number to the auxiliary display device” and “the auxiliary display device determin[ing] a particular uniform resource locator (URL) associated with the current tuned channel number utilizing the current tuned channel number provided by the STB” as recited by Applicant’s claims 1 and 14 and “the STB transmitting the VCM [the VCM including uniform resource locator (URL) information associated with at least one program channel] to the auxiliary display device”, “the STB transmitting the current tuned channel number to the auxiliary display device”, and “the auxiliary display device correlating the current tuned channel number to a particular URL contained in the VCM utilizing the current tuned channel number provided by the STB” as recited by Applicant’s claim 7 and “the STB transmits the current tuned channel number to the auxiliary display device via the remote server and the auxiliary device determines the web page to be displayed

utilizing the current tuned channel number provided by the STB” as recited by Applicant’s claim 21. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 7, 14, and 21 under 35 U.S.C 103(a).

Dependent claims 2-6, 8-13, 15-20, and 22-25 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claims 1, 7, 14, and 21 respectively. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claims 2-6, 8-13, 15-20, and 22-25 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

#### Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant’s attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 505278, Motorola Mobility, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 24, 2011

Motorola Mobility, Inc.  
600 North US Hwy 45, W2-55BB  
Libertyville, IL 60048-5343  
Customer No. 43471

By: /Susan R.M. Payne/  
Susan R.M. Payne  
Registration No. 52,033  
Attorney of Record  
(858) 404-2177